

REMARKS

Claims 6, 11-15 and 20 have been amended. Claims 7-10 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 21-22 have been added. Claims 6, 11-17 and 19-22 remain for consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

2-3. Claims 6-20 currently stand rejected for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 6, 15 and 20 have been amended to replace the language “playback transducer” with “video display device”, thus rendering this rejection moot.

4-5. Claims 6-20 currently stand rejected for allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter deemed to be the present invention.

Claims 6, 11-15 and 20 have been amended.

7-8. Claims 6-20 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of U.S. Patent 6,611,537 to Edens (hereinafter “Edens”).

Claim 6

As amended claim 6 recites a motor vehicle optical ring network that includes:

“ an optical data line configured in a ring network;
at least one data source connected to the optical data line, and provides compressed multimedia data onto the optical data line; and
at least one data sink connected to the optical data line and comprising a video display device, and that receives the compressed multimedia data from the

optical data line, where the data sink includes a bit stream decoder to decompress the received compressed multimedia data and provide (i) a decompressed video data signal indicative thereof to the video display device and (ii) a decompressed audio signal;

where the at least one data sink also includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed multimedia data by the bit stream decoder based upon the compression format of the received compressed multimedia data, where the format of the received compressed multimedia data may be one of a plurality of compression formats.” (cl. 6).

The Official Action contends, *inter alia*, that Edens discloses “*at least one data sink connected to the optical data line and comprises a transducer, i.e., a playback transducer (CD/DVD player or multimedia PC of Fig. 1).*” (emphasis added; Official Action pg. 4). The Official Action further contends that “*a multimedia PC 170 can be functioned as a controller in controlling devices to adapt to transmit and receive digital media t/and from other network devices according to formats, types, or protocols.*” (Official Action pg. 5). Thus, the Official Action contends that there are two different constructions of Edens that render the claimed invention obvious. Specifically, as noted above the Official Action contends that the data sink in Edens includes a playback device that comprises either a CD/DVD player 150, 160 or the multimedia PC 170 of Fig. 1. The first construction reads the previously claimed playback device onto one of the CD/DVD players 150, 160 disclosed in Edens, and reads the claimed controller onto the multimedia PC 170. The second construction reads both the claimed controller and the previously claimed playback device onto the multimedia PC 170 of Edens. We shall discuss each construction separately, and why each construction of Edens is incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious.

THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS NON-OBVIOUS OVER THE FIRST CONSTRUCTION OF EDENS

In the first construction, the Official Action reads the previously claimed playback device

onto one of the CD/DVD players 150, 160 disclosed in Edens and reads the claimed controller unit onto the multimedia PC 170. This rejection was improper for several reasons. First, a CD/DVD player can not be construed as the claimed video display device. A CD/DVD player is a data source that requires an audio transducer or video display device in order to provide information to the user. In the context of the present invention, the video display device of the data sink receives decompressed video data for playback – a CD/DVD player is of course incapable of receiving decompressed video data for playback. Edens, and in particular a construction of Edens where a video display device as now claimed is read onto the CD/DVD player of Edens, is incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since there is no teaching or suggestion of the CD/DVD player of Edens receiving decompressed video data for playback. In fact, Edens even teaches that the CD/DVD players 150, 160 provide MPEG2 compressed data that is decompressed by the decoders 151, 161, respectively for playback on their associated TV 155, 165, respectively. Hence, the contention in the Official Action that the previously claimed playback device reads on the CD/DVD player is incorrect since the CD/DVD player is not a playback device, and the CD/DVD player does not receive decompressed data for playback as does the video display device recited in claim 6. In fact, Edens teaches that the CD/DVD players 150, 160 only provide data. Specifically, Edens states “...other source devices include CD/DVD players 150 (in room 102) and 160 (in room 106)”. (emphasis added, col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 1). There is no teaching in Eden of the CD/DVD players 150, 160 receiving decompressed video data for playback as recited in the claimed invention.

THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS NON-OBVIOUS OVER THE SECOND CONSTRUCTION OF EDENS

In the second construction, the Official Action reads both the previously claimed playback device (now a video display device) and the claimed control unit onto the multimedia PC 170 of

Edens (see Official Action, pgs. 2-3). This rejection is also improper. Amended claim 6 recites that the data sink comprises: (i) the bit stream decoder, (ii) a video display device and (iii) the control unit. The rejection in the Official Action would read both the claimed video display device and the claimed control unit onto the multimedia PC (see Official Action, pgs. 2-3). As set forth in claim 6, the claimed video display device receives decompressed video data for playback. However, in Edens the multimedia PC 170 is described as merely a control unit (see col. 14, lines 42-51) and as a data source (col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 1). That is, Edens neither discloses nor suggests that the multimedia PC 170 receives decompressed video data for playback, and accordingly the multimedia PC 170 is incapable as being construed as the claimed video display device.

The Official Action responded to Applicant's arguments put forth in response to the prior Official Action by contending that "*applicants basically argue on 'the playback transducer' since the examiner interprets 'the playback transducer' as either a multimedia PC or electronic devices BECAUSE even the applicants do not clearly address what the playback transducer is. The examiner carefully reads the entire specification and nowhere describes what item exactly being referred to as 'the playback transducer', i.e., whether it means for the car radio 12 or user device 15 or amplifier device 14. Each of them can be interpreted 'loosely' as 'the playback transducer' for their function as receiving video or audio signals from source DVD 13 and play it back. Through out the specifications, only one 'a playback transducer' is mentioned on a last line of page 13 (revised specifications dated 1/20/2006), and nowhere else afterward to further address what the playback transducer is. Therefore, applicants' claims are rejected under both 35 USC 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs as above, and the examiner respectfully believes not to make any mistake in interpreting the term 'playback transducer' as the office action previously stated.*" (Official Action

pg. 3). However, these contentions in the Official Action are now moot in view of the amendments made to claim 6. That is, amended claim 6 now clearly recites the features of the data sink comprising, *inter alia*, a video display device, and decompressed video data is provided to the video display device for playback. Thus any prior alleged uncertainty as to the structure and function of the claimed invention has been removed by these amendments to claim 6. In addition, because the claimed video display device plays back the decompressed video data it is clear that, as discussed in detail above, the multimedia PC 170 of Edens does not meet the features of the claimed video display device.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of amended claim 6 is now moot and should be removed, and that amended claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 15

Amended claim 15 recites an optical ring network for use in a motor vehicle. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 6.

Claim 20

Since claim 20 stands rejected for the identical reasons as claim 6, and since claim 20 has been amended similarly to claim 6 discussed above, the arguments above with respect to the patentability of amended claim 6 are equally applicable to amended claim 20. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 6.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-20 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patrick J. O'Shea", is written over a horizontal line.

Patrick J. O'Shea

Registration No. 35,305

O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.

1500 Main Street, Suite 912

Springfield, Massachusetts 01115

Telephone: (413) 731-3100, x102